



T H E

LITERARY MAGAZINE.

A P R I L 1736.

ARTICLE XVIII.

The SCHEME and CONDUCT of PROVIDENCE. In twelve Chapters. By Mr. WELSTED. London; Printed for J. Walthoe, over-against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill. In Octavo. Containing 136 Pages, besides a Dedication and Table of Contents.



HE wise man's observation, that *there is nothing new under the sun*, has been frequently applied in the case of argument and literature; and tho' the number of books, on each subject, is excessively multiplied, we very seldom meet with any thing new, but the form and dress in which the matter appears, or the turn in expressing what has been said a thousand times in other, and sometimes better words. Our author, however, is persuaded he

has started something, in a great degree, *new and untouched*, and that his treatise has a tendency to account for things, which have not, to his knowledge at least, been accounted for, or not fully, by other writers. The difficulty arising from the conclusion of the fourth commandment, where GOD is represented, *visiting the sins of the fathers on their children*, is of this sort; and was what first suggested the design of his little piece. As the author is blessed with a fruitful brain, he afterwards enlarged his plan, and

R took

took in whatever seem'd most material to the defence, in general, of this particular branch of revelation. How well he has supported the character of a champion for reveal'd religion, will appear from a distinct view of the essay before us; the reader will see, however, that tho' it contains something really *new*, it at the same time revives a few ancient notions, and later conceits, which the generality of christians have usually considered as errors, to say no worse of them.

He sets out with giving what he terms the general purport of the first chapters of *Genesis*. In this view, he observes, that man was created in a state of innocence and happiness, which he lost by his disobedience. "It does not, says our author, appear from the account we have of the matter (in the book of *Genesis*) nor can be directly inferred'd from it, that men are born with any pravity, corruption, or weakness in their nature, but what *Adam* had as well, and alike before, as after his fall." To which it may be replied, that other parts of the sacred writings are more express on the fatal consequences of the fall, and tell us, that by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, &c. But, this will not pass for good authority; and we shall see hereafter, why our assertor of divine revelation allows little or no weight to the apostolical writings. In the meantime it might be asked, what pravity, what corruption, what

weakness can be supposed in man before his fall, while he was innocent and happy? Whether God would, on a review of his works, have pronounced them all *very good*, if man had originally been that weak, inconsistent creature he now is? So true is that excellent observation of Mr. *Pascal*, that how great a riddle soever original sin may appear to man, he is himself a greater riddle, without supposing and admitting it.

It is asserted, however, that "tho' man by his disobedience, " was made subject to death, "and the various ailments and infirmities that attend it; the frame of his mind was still the same; his liberty was not altered; and the whole difference in regard to *Adam*, and his posterity, was, that their state and circumstances here on earth were changed: instead of mortal, they were become temporary beings; instead of an easy and undisturbed condition, were doom'd to a laborious and afflicted one." But, why were death, infirmities, labour, &c. entailed on the descendants of the first man and woman, who alone transgres'd the divine command? Till this question is satisfactorily answered, it is to little purpose to harangue on the injustice of the imputation of original sin.

"The goodness and justice of God, says Mr. *Welsley*, could not permit, that, either the ends of his providence should be defeated, by their sin; or their descendants, who had

“ had no share in this particular guilt, should finally suffer, or be the worse for it.” Here follow the promise made by the Almighty of a *Redeemer*, and that of multiplying *Abraham’s* posterity. “ All which did imply, that *God* would in time raise up a *man* of the race of *Adam*, by *Abraham*, who should repair all the mischiefs, &c.” Here *God* is represented like a politician baffled in his projected measures, and having recourse to new plans. “ Thus, says our author, the first scheme being set aside by the transgression of our ancestor, *God* in his wisdom prepares a second, whereby the posterity of *Adam* should be fully compensated in another world for what they were made liable to in this, through his crime.” The reparation would have been more compleat, and, according to the principles of such as deny *original sin*, more just, if his innocent posterity had been, in this world, restored to all the advantages forfeited by the offender.

Thus much for the *Fall*. The *Mosaic* accounts of what passed from *Adam* down to *Noah*, are extremely short; but our author thinks, “ it may be collected from them, that the posterity of *Cain*, either led by his example, or rather from the natural imbecillity of their minds (an imbecillity which *Adam* had as well, and alike before, as after the fall) trod in his steps, and went mostly into evil courses.”—As

“ soon as the world grew populous, even the posterity, the whole posterity of *Seth*, except *Noah* and his family, as well as that of *Cain*, plunged themselves into sin, and virtue, and the fear of *God* were totally abandoned.”

The second chapter begins with some reflections on the frailty and insufficiency of human nature: the bad use man made of his reason during the first two thousand years of the world, or the weakness of that faculty in comparison of the passions, &c. with this pleasant observation, that the passions “ were at first at their full growth, and could be urged to no higher pitch; while reason was feeble, and in its childhood, and unfit for a contest, which it is scarce equal to in its maturest state.”

It is no small consolation to those, who, in this enlighten’d age, are, by way of contempt, stiled *Believers*, that their adversaries cannot explain their own wonderful system, without making *God* the author of evil; for so he must be, if this was the case of man before the fall. How much more simple and consistent is it to say, that man by his disobedience became subject to ignorance and concupiscence: that his liberty was weaken’d, &c. and that these miseries were relieved, these infirmities assisted by the grace of the *Redeemer*? Mr. *Wolsted* is very positive that, in the first ages, mankind was utterly ignorant of the true nature and unity of *God*, his omnipresence, and eternal existence, of his provi-

dential care over his creation, and our continual dependence on him. "These, he tells us, are theories, which, if discoverable at all by reason, are not so without a vast stretch of mind, in very long deductions, or in very metaphysical arguments, which few even now are capable of entering into." To which he confidently adds, that "as to the capital grand point, the doctrine of a future state, of all others most productive of true goodness, there *must have* been also in those times an utter ignorance of it." To which he adds: "It was long after their days (those of the first race of men) and that through several successive lights and assistances, e'er *human reason* came to be in any measure an uniform guide, and a monitor to be relied on. It is not so at this time, but to a very small number; consequently, in its origin and *infancy*, it must have been far from being a competent rule, and such a one as was *equal* to men's wants, and *perfective* of their felicity." This being laid down as the basis of a structure composed of old and new materials curiously intermixed, Mr. *Welsley* proposes to explain the various methods and provisions made use of by **GOD** for assisting man in the exercise of virtue, and enabling him to attain all the happiness, destined for him in this state. But, before he proceeds, he thinks himself under a necessity of saying something to an objection, which indeed, according to the doctrine

of his treatise, is not a little formidable. He has supposed "it was not in men's power, or not without great and almost insuperable difficulty, to live well and virtuously :" And must suppose this was *Adam's* case even before the fall; for he expressly says, *page 7*, that "his children had the same power and freedom derived to them, which he had, and the same ability, whatever that was, to please or displease God, to follow or depart from the dictates of nature." This being the case, it is asked, how men could justly be punished? The answer is profound and surprisingly satisfactory. "They were not in effect punished, if I may give it that name, other wise than *necessity* and their own good required. For after their *degeneracy* was grown to such a height and universality, that no means of reformation were left, an all-good Creator could not suffer things to go on in that course; and it was more merciful far to exterminate that race at once, than to let them live any longer, overwhelm'd in sin and misery, &c. What fine reasoners do our learned times produce! The first race of men were *necessarily* destitute of the great incitements to, and supports of virtue," *page 16*; and yet they were cut off for their sins. This logic is indeed somewhat above our comprehension. Numbers of men, the whole world, eight persons only excepted, destroy'd, and that by an *all-good Creator*, for

for their degeneracy; and yet it was hardly in their power, if at all, to avoid it. When this part of the *Conduct of Providence* is reconciled to Mr. *Welsley's* idea of the *goodness* and *justice* of *God*, it will be time to call for an explanation of the communication of *original sin*, and the justice of its imputation to *Adam's* posterity.

The third chapter opens with the *deluge*. "And now, says Mr. *Welsley*, the great plan for man's redemption and happiness is going into execution... For the accomplishing of this, and to the end that *God's* promise to drown the world no more might stand inviolable, two things were chiefly and indispensably of importance; viz. to prevent the same degeneracy from prevailing at any time after the flood; and to keep the knowledge of one *God*, Maker of heaven and earth, from being quite lost and sunk in idolatry." The first of these was *necessary*; because, if a total loss of virtue and goodness had happen'd a second time, the same remedy would have been required again: our author is very positive, that "another universal corruption must have produc'd another universal deluge; no reformation, in that state, being to be hoped for, or effected;" and "that, in such a situation, there is no room even for the influences of *God's grace* and *spirit*, which are supposed to come only in aid of men's own endeavours. These, says he, may rekindle the sparks of dying

" religion; but never create virtue and goodness where they are not, &c." The necessity of the second thing here required, is founded on two suppositions: that idolatry "must of course, without the divine interposition, soon have become universal;" and that, had it once been so, it must have continued so; if no one nation had had the knowledge of *God*, all others would have remain'd without it."

We refer the curious to the treatise itself for the proofs of these two suppositions; and proceed to the fourth chapter, in which the author undertakes to consider, as he calls it, the first of these branches, viz. the preventing a second total loss of virtue and goodness. The pride and madness of men inspiring them with the unaccountable project of building a tower which should reach to heaven, we are told it was *needful*, not that the wisdom of *God* thought proper, to interpose. But the same strain runs through the whole treatise; and our author every where speaks as if he had adequate ideas of the *wisdom*, *justice*, &c. of *God*, and knew perfectly well that the Almighty *must* in particular cases have done this or that, and *could* have done nothing else so proper, and so well suited to the respective ends. But to proceed; it pleased *God*, "as the *fittest* means for remedying the mischiefs at hand, and in order to make way for farther applications of his *wisdom*, to scatter mankind, and divide them into several people and languages." That this

this was the *best* and most *effectual*, if not the *only* method, the divine **Wisdom** could have employ'd for preventing the wickedness, into which men were hastening, is to be shewn in the sequel of this chapter. The reasons here alledged are, that this wickedness and these wicked projects were no longer to be contrived or carried on unanimously and universally: the irregularities, which might have their birth from a few men, could not now be propagated to great numbers: the tokens of divine wrath, levelled on one people for their sins, might prove a warning to others: men might thus be made checks reciprocally on each other, and become instruments in the hands of **GOD** of rewards and chastisements. On this footing, our author infers it was morally impossible that an universal degeneracy should ever take place again.

"Over and above this, says he, it pleased **GOD**, at different times, to send into the world divers persons excellent for the edification of human nature, and remarkably to illuminate and pour his grace and favour on them to this end." Among these are placed the heroes, whom the great writers of antiquity mention in their fables and allegories, as descended from the gods, "that is, says Mr. *Welsford*, they were enlightened by the **GOD** of gods, and, through his special favour, cleared the mists from men's eyes, and shew'd them the paths to truth and virtue." It might, perhaps, seem a little uncharitable to say our author

ranks these pagan heroes with those mentioned in the Old Testament, and ascribes no other *inspiration* to the latter than to the former; but a common reader would be apt to suspect him in this point. "Early, and at the head of those who appear'd in this high and sacred character, were *Abraham*, *Lot*, *Melchizedech*, *Job*, at least the writer of the book of *Job*, and others probably, whose names we have not heard of." To which he adds, "After them arose *Hermes*, *Zoroaster*, *Orpheus*, *Pythagoras*, *Numa*, *Cyrus*, and the several great poets, law-givers, and philosophers among the Greeks and *Romans*."

We are come now to the second essential in the *Scheme of Providence*, viz. the keeping the knowledge of the only true **GOD**, from being wholly lost; which, according to our author, could not probably have been so well done, as by separating it from the rest of the world, a particular people, and training them gradually in that knowledge." This being supposed, he, in his fifth and sixth chapters, undertakes to produce and explain the several steps, which it pleased **GOD** to take, in order to support, and make good this branch of his *System*.

Here we have the history of the people of **GOD**, from the call of *Abraham*, to their leaving *Egypt*, with our author's opinion on the fitness of the means used on each occasion, and at each juncture. In the seventh chapter, is consider'd what was farther required for preserving

serving God's true worship and belief among the *Jews*; for Mr. *Welsford* is of opinion, that, "whatever was past, would have lost its force, but for what came after." This is followed by the *Israelites* journey through the wilderness, the miracles done in their favour, the delivery of the law, with its character, &c.

The eighth chapter opens with the second commandment, and we are now to see how *visiting the iniquities of the fathers on the children unto the third and fourth generation*, is to be understood. "To punish the innocent, for the faults of the guilty; and to reward the guilty, for the deeds of the innocent, &c." is what at first sight flies in the face of reason, says Mr. *Welsford*; it thwarts, and confounds all our ideas of justice and goodness, and is contrary to our clearest conceptions of the nature and attributes of God."--- "Tho' the goodness of a maxim or action, will not prove alone, that it comes from God; yet its badness will always prove, that it does not come from him. "Tho' a principle or action is not made just, because it is from him; yet its being unjust, absolutely shews it is not from him." *A principle or action is not made just, because it is from him!* It is not indeed the first time this language has been heard; but we have reason to complain, it was never made intelligible. Certainly, if we are once convinced of the fact, that the principle or action does come

from God, it follows, that it is, and must be just, tho' our finite and limited capacities may not always clearly and distinctly conceive the reason of it. No; but its being unjust, absolutely shews it is not from him; that is, whatever seems to clash with our shallow notions of justice, must be rejected, as not coming from God; and no testimony, in favour of revelation, must be admitted, how strong soever it may be, if our sovereign lady, human reason, which is all along own'd to be very weak, thinks fit to pronounce it contains something unjust. This is no better than destroying, or discrediting all the exterior evidence for divine revelation, and resolving all into caprice, enthusiasm, and the wildest uncertainty. Does our author expect every man will see with his eyes, or judge with his judgment? If not, and if others are at full liberty to pursue their own notions, and decide according to their own ideas of fitness, justice and goodness, independent of actual revelation, several actions, &c. which he receives, as just, will be pronounced unjust, and consequently not coming from God.

But let us see how the menace pronounced in the second commandment is justified by our learned commentator. "It is, says he, to be understood in a limited sense, and as confined to one particular case, that is, as regarding alone the sin of idolatry; and this only with respect to the *Jews*." But how will this restriction salve the matter?

matter? One particular people, at least, are to be punish'd for one sin, committed by their fathers; which will still be unjust, according to Mr. *Welsley's* notion of justice. But to proceed; " that it was " originally intended to be so " understood, is plain from hence, " that these words *for I the Lord* " *thy God am a jealous God,* " *visiting the iniquities, &c.* are " annex'd to this commandment " only, and not to the rest." Not to mention several cases in scripture, where children were *visited*, that is, temporally afflicted for the sins of their father, the very words under consideration are, *Exod. xxxiv. 7.* used in a general sense, and without the restriction here produced. Which spoils a deal of the author's fine reasoning on this occasion. He labours hard, however, to prove the justice of God's conduct in this particular case; but unfortunately all his arguments, if they may without offence be called so, recoil on himself. " Circumstances, he tells us, " give things another nature and " essence: particular times and " occasions, expediency or ne- " cessity, alter the reason of ac- " tion, and the standard of right " and wrong." Tho' this way of speaking is very far from exact, it is easy to reply that this diversity of circumstances, &c. may happen in other cases, and consequently justify a *visitation on the children* for other crimes beside idolatry.

It would be endless to pursue our author step by step; let us therefore proceed to his ninth chapter, which is very short, and

contains little more than a piece of self-congratulation on having vindicated the justice and goodness of God in the particular *law* mention'd; the destruction of the *Canaanites*, and the spirit of the *Jewish* law. In the tenth, it is observ'd, that the *methods* used by God in regard to his people " had a due and proper effect; " however not such, as render'd " farther interpositions of the " divine power needless;" as appears from their frequent relapses into idolatry, before the captivity. This remark is followed by the dispositions of the *Jews* and the state of the heathen world, at the time when the *Messiah* appear'd. But *Porphyry* asked, *why a merciful God could for so many ages, from Adam to Moses, and from Moses to CHRIST, suffer whole nations to perish, through ignorance of his will and law;* and *why it was necessary for CHRIST to come so late, and not before an innumerable multitude of men had been lost?* Mr. *Welsley* knows, or ought to have known, that the reply to such questions is, that they proceed on a false supposition: that the *Messiah* was to satisfy the Divine Justice for the sins of *all men*, both those who had lived before his time, and those who should be born after: that in view of this satisfaction, and by the merits of the *Messiah*, men might, even before his coming, have sanctified themselves, and obtain'd remission of their sins. But such a reply did not suit with his favourite *Scheme*; for, in his eleventh and twelfth chapters, proceeding

proceeding on a supposition, which no real christian makes, viz. "that all, who lived before CHRIST, whether Jews or Gentiles, are perished, or in a state of damnation, by their being incapable on that account of any benefit from his merits," he quite throws off the veil and steps forth a worthy disciple of Socinus. "In respect of CHRIST's merits, says our author, his redemption, and satisfaction for sins, these are, in reality, a set of phrases, or notions, which have usurped a meaning that, I hope, does not belong to them 'Tis true, the apostles sometimes make mention of atonement and expiation; but these expressions, when used by them, are either a typical way of speaking and description, and in allusion to the rites of the Mosaic institution; or else are urged by them in their reasonings and debates with the Jews, as fit arguments to them, &c.

Mr. *Welsford* was sensible that St. Paul has on several occasions expres'd himself with great plainness and strength concerning the satisfaction of CHRIST, the redemption, &c. and therefore goes a short way to work, and disqualifies all the apostles as witnesses for those articles of our faith. "The apostles, no doubt, were persons highly favour'd of GOD, and so far under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, as was necessary to enable them to execute their great trust, which was to inform mankind of the truth of those wondrous

" facts the resurrection and ascension They do not seem to insist on all they say, as absolutely inspired, and, on some occasions, they actually disclaim inspirations." What, in the name of common sense, can be meant by the words last quoted? St. Paul doth indeed own he has no command of the LORD, concerning virgins, or which obliges to virginity; but is this disclaiming inspiration?

Is it not highly probable that Mr. *Welsford* was in great want of sleep when he wrote the following period? "A great part of christians prefer, first, the discourses of the apostles to those of their Master: then the writings and opinions of the fathers to those of the apostles; and lastly, the decisions and judgment of the modern church to the decisions of both the others." It does not indeed appear in what order he receives these several testimonies, or what credit he is willing to allow either of them apart, or all together; but it is evident, from the whole tenour of his treatise, that he places his own darling notions above them all; and is ever unwilling to allow any thing divinely revealed, which does not suit with them. Thus, for example, "Messiah came not to expiate past transgressions so much, as to provide against future ones the main drift of CHRIST's mission was to bring mankind to a perfect knowledge of the true GOD, and of the absolute unity of his nature and to prevent

" all confusion and perplexity of ideas in this point, our LORD frequently stiles himself the *Son of man*; at the same time that he is most properly, and in a superlative manner, the *Son of GOD*. *This is my beloved Son*, &c. that is, this is the *sacred Person*, so eminently *favour'd and beloved* by me; and this day he enters his sublime, illustrious office of CHRIST, *Messiah*, lord and judge of this world. If the passage be understood, as I have explain'd it, it is, I will dare to say, the finest instance of figurative speech that can be conceived, and most admirably expressive of, and suited to the majesty of the thing it represents. Thus is CHRIST the Son of GOD in a sense more excellent far than any other of the *angels of GOD*, who are also often call'd in scripture the *sons of GOD*." The rest of this chapter is all in the same strain; but as the proper divinity of JESUS CHRIST has been abundantly proved beyond any reasonable contradictions, we shall pass on to the conclusion of the treatise before us.

Our author here congratulates the *rational* and *virtuous* part of the *deists* on the good effects of their endeavours, no doubt undesign'd by them, and returns them thanks for the service, which he thinks they have done to the cause of GOD and *christianity*; nothing so much aiding and promoting the interests of the *true religion* as a free and unreserved

enquiry into it. *Infidelity*, however, according to him, is not *criminal*, tho' it may be *unreasonable*. He passes by "the rabble of Free-thinkers, however, with all the charity and contempt, that can be in a man's heart." One would be tempted to enquire what notion this worthy gentleman entertains of *charity*, when he supposes it compatible with *contempt*. "They are, says he, *libertines, fanatics, pedlars, any thing you please, but not, in propriety, deists*." The ladies, it seems, are got into this mode; whom the author, very politely says, "one can neither convince by reason, nor reprove without ill-manners." The character of a *true Free-thinker* is so sacred, that men who have neither sense nor learning have no right to it. Such persons, according to this writer, ought to keep to the track, and to the community they were brought up in; if their fathers were *churchmen*, they ought to be *churchmen*; if their fathers were *muggletonians*, it behoves them also to be *muggletonians*." Is not this most pleasant casuistry? But what follows is, at least, as extraordinary. "Believing, I will allow, is very generally an infirmity; 'tis the property of weak and ignorant minds. a person may be excused, who has no reason of his faith; but it is utterly unfair in men to have no reason for their infidelity." We are not to be surprised at these flights, since the author kindly promises, in his *introduction*,

introduction, not to load his treatise with *superfluous erudition*; and it must be own'd, to his honour, that he has faithfully kept his word through the whole.

ARTICLE XIX.

The Life of the Emperor JULIAN, continued; being the Sequel of Article XII.

JULIAN, being now returned to *Constantinople*, gain'd the affections of the people by an air of modesty and popularity, which was as new as engaging. *Constantius* had treated the senate with haughtiness. He sent for the members of that illustrious body, not with a design of consulting them, but of roughly signifying his will and pleasure. He never allow'd them to sit in his presence, or appear in their assemblies. On the contrary, *Julian* was constant in his attendance at their meetings, and allow'd every one to give his opinion with full liberty. Our historian tells us, he was the first and last of the emperors, since *Julius Cesar*, who made a practice of haranguing the senate. If this be true, *Tacitus* and *Dion Cassius* must have made several speeches of that kind, which they put into the mouths of *Augustus* and *Tiberius*.

The new emperor's promotion had not made him forget *Maximus* and *Chrysanthus*. He invited them to *Constantinople*, in order to divide the cares of the government with him. Those philosophers, who were at *Sardis*, when they receiv'd *Julian's* letter, had recourse to the mysteries of the

urgy, to know whether they should undertake the journey. *Chrysanthus* terrified at the result of the operation, retir'd, and remain'd at a distance from the imperial city; but *Maximus*, blinded by his ambition, despised the prognostics, and hasten'd to court, where he ruled both the empire and the emperor. Here our author gives us a short history of the fate of *Maximus*, in the reign of *Valens*, to shew that *Chrysanthus* had acted with more prudence than his friend.

Julian, who had sworn the destruction of christianity, formed a resolution of condemning its professors to ignorance, by forbidding them to learn or teach the *Grecian* sciences. Mortified at the use, which the christians made of the study of antiquity, of eloquence and logic, in refuting error and establishing the truth, he made a law, which gave them the choice of worshipping the gods, or confining themselves to the explanation of *Luke* and *Matthew*, in the churches of the *Galileans*. How contemptibly soever the emperor affected to speak of the christians, he was but too well convinced that they were in possession of all the virtues, supported by a wise and regular discipline;

discipline ; and the contract between their morals and those of the idolaters, reflected more disgrace on paganism, than *Julian* with all his power could give it credit or authority. He therefore enter'd into a project of opposing virtues to virtues, and discipline to discipline ; in fine, of reforming idolatry ; which his historian calls *dressing folly in the livery of wisdom*. In this view, he began his reformation with the priests and pontiffs ; and borrow'd some of the purest maxims of christianity, some of the most holy customs and regulations of the church, which our author gives at large from three of the emperor's letters.

Such were the means, which *Julian* employ'd for giving paganism credit in the world, while he had recourse to low and unworthy artifices for surprising the christians into acts of idolatry. It was customary at that time to pay to the images of the emperors, as well as to their persons, a respect which was termed *adoration*. As this respect was merely of a civil nature, the christians made no difficulty of conforming to it. *Julian*, who turn'd every thing to the advantage of paganism, caused himself to be represented with his gods. In one piece, for example, was *Jupiter* offering him the imperial diadem and the purple ; while *Mars* and *Mercury* beheld the prince with an air of complaisance, and seem'd to applaud his valour and eloquence. Thus the christians were reduced to the unhappy alternative of seeming either to adore the pagan divinities,

or to fail in their respect to the emperor ; and accordingly, those who had penetration enough to discern the snare, and conscience enough to avoid falling into it, were treated as rebels, and punished as traitors. Tho' this diabolical policy made some apostates, it multiplied the number of confessors, whose generous suffering procured them all the merit and honour of martyrdom.

Julian deprived the ecclesiastis of the immunities granted them by *Constantine* and his sons ; and stripped the churches of the revenues which those princes had assigned for the maintenance of the clergy, and the poor. If the injured christians offer'd to complain of this treatment, they were told, that *Their admirable law promises the kingdom of heaven to the poor* : that *it was but reasonable to facilitate their journey* : that *poverty would render them wise in this world, and happy in the next*.

In a reign so favourable to paganism, the persecution soon became general, especially in the east. The churches were plundered, burnt, demolished, & profaned : the tombs of the martyrs destroy'd : their bones thrown into the fire with the bones of beasts, and the ashes scatter'd in the air. The idolaters of *Palestine* and *Phenicia* committed barbarities equal to those practis'd under *Dioclesian*. *Julian*, surrounded by pagans, might possibly be unacquainted with some of those extravagancies ; but he excused others in consideration of the zeal and intention of those who exceeded his orders. Of

this we have the following instance. The inhabitants of *Gaza* had massacred some christians ; and treated their dead bodies with the same wanton cruelty that was elsewhere exercised on the relics of the martyrs. The governor of that province was one of those, who hesitate between their duty and their fortune, and would fain make them go hand in hand. He had imprisoned a small number of the most seditious pagans, after passing sentence of death on several christians. The city of *Gaza*, which expected the most severe correction from the emperor, was agreeably surprised to hear the governor was disgraced and banished for his conduct to the pagans. *Ought you*, said *Julian*, *to imprison Greeks for taking their revenge on some Galileans, who had so often insulted their persons and their gods?* " Thus, as our author observes, " he divested himself of the quality of a common father, and " armed his subjects one against " another, to the detriment of " the whole empire."

Whenever the christians represented their grievances, and implored his protection against the rage of their enemies, his answer was, *Have you just reason for complaint? Every christian is called to suffer.* Thus, by his bitter railleries, and a refusal of justice, he render'd useless his general prohibitions of persecution and constraint. " In reality (it is the historian's reflection) " the " will of a prince is always better " executed than his laws ; and " his will is not known by a

" language of ceremony, but by " certain actions, which proceed " from the bottom of his heart." *Julian*, however, on other occasions, was sensible of the inconveniency of a too visible partiality, and was obliged to chastise the pagans. The conduct of *George*, the *Arian* bishop of *Alexandria*, was such as raised the whole city against him. The catholics detested him as a sanguinary enemy : the pagans as the destroyer of their gods ; and every one as a partisan, an extortioner, and a robber. He was seized by a party of the heathens and thrown into prison ; from whence they dragged him about the streets and left him dead on the spot. *Dracontius*, master of the mint, and *Diodorus*, who held the rank of count, were massacred by the same incensed mob : the former for having demolished an altar ; the latter for cutting off the hair of some children which the pagans let grow in honour of their gods. *Julian* seem'd very much enraged at the news of these proceedings. As the heathens were the only criminals, he could not connive at their crime, without reflecting a disgrace on his own person and on paganism itself. He therefore would have punished them severely, had not *Julian*, his mother's brother, and an apostate like himself, obtain'd their pardon ; with which he sent a letter testifying his just indignation, representing the heinousness of the action, and the greatness of the favour done them.

Julian did not express the like indignation at the barbarity of the inhabitants

inhabitants of *Arethusa* in Syria. *Mark*, bishop of that city, one of those who had saved the emperor's life in his infancy, had drawn on himself the hatred of the infidels by labouring for their conversion with too much vivacity, and particularly by demolishing one of their most celebrated temples in the late reign. They now resolved to force him to rebuild it at his own expence. To this end, the whole town exercised all their rage on him in torments, of which we have but few examples in history, without being able to force from him one farthing or a sigh; and without even making him change the serenity of his countenance. He tired his executioners, and obliged them to admire his courage and desist from their purpose. The ungrateful emperor received the account of these barbarities without the least emotion. "Julian," "as our historian observes, pro-
"tected malecontents, incendia-
"ries, schismatics, those who
"had been degraded for their
"crimes; in a word, all such as
"he thought proper instruments
"for disturbing the peace of the
"church, were supported in the
"pursuit of their pretensions."

But the persecution of the christians was not Julian's sole employment. He revived the old laws, with some amendments and explanations; to which he added several new regulations. He reduced the taxes; and either refused or moderated what his predecessors had exacted under the specious title of presents; made several equitable and useful regula-

tions, in regard to the public administration of justice, and restor'd discipline among his troops.

Having resolved to attack the *Perians*, he set out for *Antioch*, after about five months stay at *Constantinople*. He passed the straights about the middle of *May* 362, and soon after arrived at *Nicomedia*. That city, the capital of *Bithynia*, had, four years before, been destroy'd by an earthquake, follow'd by a fire which burnt fifty days. Julian, having made ample provision for rebuilding it, pursued his journey, and reached *Antioch* before the end of *July*; where he signaliz'd his arrival by an act of clemency. *Thalassius*, one of the magistrates of that city, who lay under Julian's displeasure, was not permitted to wait on him with the others at his entrance. Those who had an interest in making him appear still more guilty, took an advantage of this conjuncture, impeached him to the emperor, and charged him with having oppressed and impoverished the people. Julian, perceiving they abused the disgrace of the unfortunate *Thalassius*, who, tho' guilty in regard to him, might perhaps be innocent in regard to others, made them the following answer: *I own, that your enemy is mine. But this very consideration ought to prevail with you to suspend your proceedings against him, till I have received satisfaction. I certainly deserve the preference.* Our author relates several other acts of this sort, which we shall pass over, and come to the main object; viz. Julian's religious behaviour, while

while at *Antioch*, and the obstacles he met with from the inhabitants of that city, when he attempted to establish idolatry among them.

That great city was almost entirely christian, and divided into three communions; two of which, disunited only by a misunderstanding in regard to *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, professed the catholic faith; the third followed the heresy of *Arius*. *Julian* was not sensible how small the number of pagans was; and the division of the christians, joined to an almost general corruption of morals, and a predominant taste for pleasures, made him imagine they had but a superficial attachment for christianity. He flattered himself they might be insensibly drawn into idolatry by the alluring gaiety of the pagan feasts, and the licentiousness indulged on such occasions. But he had formed a wrong idea of *Antioch*. The *Arians*, who were the stronger and most numerous party, could not be pleased with the successor and enemy of *Constantius*; and the inhabitants in general, tho' sunk into debauchery, valued themselves on the appellation of *christians*, which was first given to the disciples of our Saviour within their walls.

The temple of *Apollo*, built by king *Seleucus*, in *Daphne*, one of the suburbs of *Antioch*, had been the scene of abominable excesses till the time of *Gallus*, who translated the body of St. *Babylas*, formerly bishop of *Antioch*, to that place, and consecrated a church to the true God, in honour of the illustrious martyr.

The place was now much less frequented by the idolaters; and the famous oracle was silent. Things had been in this situation about eleven years. *Julian*, at his arrival, surprised and incensed at the progress of christianity in *Antioch*, and the indifference of the few remaining pagans, he reprimanded the senate, in a manner worthy of an apostle of paganism, says our historian; who gives us his speech to them on that occasion; and adds, that it produced no effect on the audience. The less complaisance that prince found on the article of religion, the more warm was his fanatical zeal: the more he labour'd to assert the honour of his gods; and the expence of the sacrifices, was excessive, even in the judgment of the pagans themselves. But nothing was so extravagant as the feasts in honour of *Venus*; for the celebration of which all business was postponed.

St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Theodore* and St. *Chrysostom* assure us, that in his nightly sacrifices and magical operations, he caused great numbers of young children to be slain, in order to consult their entrails: that time reveal'd those horrid mysteries; and that, after *Julian*'s death, several chests full of heads and carcases were found in wells, and other places at a distance from his palace. These facts are so very shocking, that our author seems willing to doubt of them.

Julian dispatched deputies to *Dodona*, to *Delphos*, to *Delos*, and to all the oracles of the empire. Their answers were favourable; but

but some of them deliver'd in so bad verse, that one might reasonably have said *Apollo* had forgot his art.

At *Daphne* the god continued mute, in spight of all the emperor's instances. He declared at last, that he was surrounded by dead bodies, and would not speak till they were removed. *Julian* took his meaning. To save appearances, he order'd the places about the temple to be purified, and all the bodies to be dug up; but the order was executed only in regard to the relics of St. *Babylas*. The christians, alarmed at this step, went in crouds to *Daphne*, and carried the venerable body in triumph to the great church in the city. *Julian*, incensed at their conduct, which he resented as an insult committed on his gods, order'd several of them to be seiz'd, and put to death.

Soon after this, the temple was consumed by fire. The christians attributed the event to the divine vengeance; and *Julian* to the resentment and jealousy of the christians. By way of reprisal, he order'd the great church to be shut up, and its riches to be deposited in the imperial treasury. *Julian*, the emperor's uncle, who was entrusted with this commission, exceeded it, according to his usual custom. He seized on *Theodoret*, a priest; and, not being able to make him renounce J E S U S C H R I S T by torture, condemn'd him to lose his head. The emperor reprimanded him severely for that action; and declared it was not his intention

to have any man executed on the account of religion.

The longer *Julian* staid at *Antioch*, the more he repented of his coming to a place where neither his virtues nor his vices were well receiv'd; and where he soon became the object of the public contempt and raillery. It was observed that the famine had follow'd him from *Constantinople* to *Antioch*, and that the springs were dried up since he had profaned them with things offer'd to his gods. In the midst of the disorders, occasioned by the great scarcity of provisions, *Julian*, persuaded that the magistrates were wanting in their duty, commanded the whole senate to be put into prison; but, on the application of *Libanius*, the order was revoked. Here we have some account of *Julian*'s writing against the christian religion; which our historian adds, that "while he opposed religion in the character of a controvertist, he employed the imperial power for destroying one of the strongest proofs in favour of it, by undertaking to rebuild the temple of *Jerusalem*, against the formal prediction of our blessed Saviour. In this view, he wrote an hypocritical letter to the *Jews*, desiring their prayers for success in the *Persepolis* war, and assuring them of his protection in the projected enterprise. Soon after which, he sent workmen from all parts to *Jerusalem*, order'd the necessary supplies for raising the intended edifice, and *Alypius*, an intimate friend of the emperor, who was made superintend-

intendant of the work, was on the spot, in order to press the execution of it. The first thing to be done was the demolishing the old foundation, and clearing the ground; which they effected; and thus fulfilled the prediction of JESUS CHRIST in the utmost rigour, *that one stone should not be left on another.* But, on attempting to lay a new foundation, terrible balls of fire burst out of the place, and consumed some of the workmen. The same thing happening several times, and the place being thus render'd inaccessible, the attempt was dropt. These are the very words of *Ammianus Marcellinus*, a writer of that time, a judicious and faithful historian, a professed pagan, and attached to *Julian's* service. Several Jews, convinced by so decisive a miracle, embraced christianity; while others, strongly persuaded that the time of their return was then come, or never would come, turned pagans in a fit of despair.

Sapor II., then king of *Perſia*, whose character our author draws at large, had offer'd to negotiate a treaty with the *Roman* emperor, on his own terms. But *Julian*, posſeſſed with the spirit of conquest, would hear of no accommodation; haughtily answering, he would go and negotiate in person. As the treasures were exhausted, and vast sums had been expended in favour of paganism, not knowing how to raise money for the approaching expedition, he laid a tax on those who should refuse to sacrifice. Several nations offer'd

him their assistance. He treated their embassadors with civility; but declin'd their offers. *The Romans*, said he, *have no need of assistance, it is their business to assist others.* *Arſacius*, king of *Armenia*, a christian, and the only ally whom he admitted, was ordered to arm, and act according to the directions he should receive. *Julian's* letter on this occasion was full of asperity and menaces; but *Arſacius* ventured to disobey him.

The *Roman* troops had now paſſed the *Euphrates*, and diſperſed themſelves in ſeveral places, from which they might reunite, at the emperor's arrival. *Julian* made an impenetrable ſecret of his plan, his route, the order of his march, and the day deſigned for his departure. On the 5th of *March*, 363, he left *Antioch*, and arrived the next day at *Berea*; where he attempted the perverſion of the ſenate, which was almoſt entirely christian; but his zeal and eloquence miſcarried. *Julian* paſſed the *Euphrates*, near *Hicrapolis*, and appear'd in *Mesopotamia*, before the enemy thought him on his march. At the beginning of *April*, he received letters from *Sallust*, preſect of the *Prætorium* for *Gaul*, conjuring him not to take the field, without firſt appealing the gods, who ſeem'd, by ſeveral prodigies, to declare againſt the *Perſian* war. But the emperor, reſolved on it, paſſed *Abora*, with his whole army, over a bridge of boats; which he cauſed to be broke immeadiately. As he continued his march, a party of foldiers preſented him

with a lion of an extraordinary size, which, having faced the army, had been shot to death. *Julian* took this as a presage of victory; but the *Tuscan Haruspices* maintained that, since the war was offensive, and the lion came up to the army, the presage threatened the emperor's life.

Julian, advancing into *Affyria*, having made great havock in the country, repassed the *Euphrates*, took some towns, and gain'd considerable advantages, undertook to express his gratitude to *Mars* by a sacrifice of ten bulls. But nine of the victims fell down dead, before they could be brought to the altar; and the tenth broke loose. With some difficulty, it was brought back, and nothing but threatening signs were observed in its entrails. Whereupon, *Julian*, in a transport of rage, protested in the presence of *Jupiter*, that he would never more sacrifice to the ungrateful god of war. This fact is related by *Ammianus*.

Hormisdas, *Sapor*'s elder brother, who had been excluded the throne of *Perisia* by the faction of the grandees, commanded *Julian*'s cavalry in this expedition. *Sapor*, terrified at the progress of the *Roman* arms, sent a messenger to his brother, entreating him to negociate a peace for him at any rate. *Hormisdas* made the desired application; but *Julian* would hear of no proposals of that kind; and soon after, he was betrayed into his ruin by an artful old *Perisan*, who had formed a resolution of sacrificing his own life, if necessary, for the

safety of his country. He pretended to be fallen into disgrace with his prince, and to seek protection among the *Romans*. Having imposed on *Julian* with a pathetic account of his pretended misfortunes, and respected protestations of a sincere zeal for the emperor, and an irreconcilable hatred of *Sapor*, he offer'd to make the *Romans* masters of *Perisia*, if they would follow his advice; which was to set fire to their fleet, then in the *Tigris*, and unite all their forces in the field. In vain did *Hormisdas* remonstrate, that it was not safe to repose a confidence in the *Perians*, who were capable of any thing, and thought nothing unlawful that might tend to the security of their king and country; *Julian* gave into the snare, and the fleet was burnt. This action occasion'd a general murmur in the army; and the soldiers asked one another whether the emperor was in correspondence with the *Perians*. *Julian* began now to open his eyes; but it was too late. The pretended deserter had made his escape, and the evil would admit of no remedy.

Julian bore this misfortune with great resolution, quitted the banks of the *Tigris*, and march'd in quest of the enemy: as he advanced, the *Perians* set fire to the forage and corn, which stopp'd the progress of the *Romans* for some days. It was now difficult to go forward, dangerous to retreat, and impossible to find provisions. In this extremity, after much deliberation, it was resolved that they should endea-

vous

your to gain a small province dependent on the *Romans*, situated in the south of *Armenia*. In their way to that country, they met the *Perſian* army, which they beat, with small loss. Not long after this advantage, *Julian* receiv'd a second visit from the *Genius* of the empire. The phantom seem'd to arise out of the earth; pale and deform'd, with a melancholy air, covering its head and *Cornucopia* with a veil. The emperor, startled at the sight, offer'd sacrifices to the gods, for diverting their anger. At the same time, he saw one of those flaming exhalations, which the vulgar take for falling stars. It was very bright, and passed over great part of the horizon. *Julian*, more terrified at this, than at the apparition of the *Genius*, immediately called for the *Tuscan Haruspices*, whose books declared that whenever a celestial firebrand appear'd, no enterprise was to be entered on, no battle fought. The emperor, however, would not submit to that authority, nor listen to their earnest entreaties to defer his departure, at leaſt, ſome hours. He decamped, met the enemy, engaged them, received a wound in his liver with a dart, and was carried out of the army. Expiring admidſt the ſighs and tears of his attendants, he endeavour'd to comfort them with a long diſcourse, in which he ſpeaks ſo favourably of himſelf, that he may be ſaid to have pronounced his own funeral oration. Having given orders for carrying his body to *Tarſus* in *Cilicia*, he died a little before midnight, June the

26th, 363, at the age of thirty one years, eight months and twenty days.

It has been reported that, finding himſelf wounded, he thought he ſaw *Jesus Christ*: that he filled his hands with his own blood and threw it toward heaven, ſaying; *Galilean, thou haſt conquer'd. What! thou purſueſt me ſtill! Well: I renounce thee again. Satiate thyſelf with my blood; for thou haſt conquer'd me.* Our historian conſiders this ſtory as the production of a miſtaken zeal, which cannot allow the perſecutors of truth to die in a common manner. *St. Gregory Nazianzen*, who will not be accused of handling *Julian* too tenderly, makes no mention of it. The fact is indeed related by *Sozomen*, *Theodore*, and the anonymous collector of the acts of the martyrdom of *Theodore*, a priest of *Antioch*: But the two firſt of thoſe writers do not venture to anſwer for the truth of it; and the third betrays a prodigious excefſ of credulity, in what he reports of *Julian*'s death.

Thus ends the life of *Julian*, composed from both christian and pagan authors. His new historian professes his design of repreſenting him ſuch as he really was. He is of opinion that moſt of the memoirs of that prince were not written with ſufficient calmneſs and moderation. "It is the fate of extraordinary men, ſays he, to have admirers and cenſors, both too full of prejudice; particularly when intereſts, ſo ſtrong as thoſe of religion, pre- vent an union of ſentiments.

“ The just indignation of the christians against an apostate and persecutor, has not always allow'd them to take notice of what might merit some esteem in his character. The blind gratitude of the pagans toward a restorer of idolatry, has shut their eyes to his most essential faults. Not to mention the orators, from whom we have no right to expect so scrupulous an exactness ; even the historians cease to be historians, the moment they speak of Julian, and become either accusers or panegyrists : we must, however, except a small number of writers on both sides, who have done him justice enough.

In reality, continues our historian, “ we are not to imagine it always impossible to reconcile the authors who have spoken the most differently of Julian. As they did not see him in the same point of view, they do indeed report different things of him ; but such as are not always contradictory ; and for the generality, if the christians and pagans seem to contradict one another, 'tis because Julian was himself a heap of contradictions. Mr. Fleury judiciously observes, “ there was in that prince such a mixture of good and bad qualities, that it was easy both to praise and condemn him without injuring the truth.

ARTICLE XX.

A true Account of the Nature, End and Efficacy of the SACRAMENT of the LORD'S SUPPER ; of the great Duty of frequenting, and of the Necessity and right Method of preparing for the worthy Participation of it. In which is contained, an Answer to a Book, entitled, A plain Account of this Sacrament. With a Preface, shewing the Agreement of this plain Account, with the Notions of the Socinians ; and its Disagreement with the Doctrine of the Church of England. By THOMAS BOWYER, M. A. Vicar of Martock, Somersetshire. London : Printed for C. Rivington, at the Bible and Crown in St. Paul's Church-yard. 1736. Containing 210 Pages, beside a Preface and Table of Contents.

THE writer of the extraordinary piece here censured, if the public conjecture be true, has always been remarkable for setting aside what the generality of christians call *authority* : he usually reasons on what he terms *principles* ; and, to do him justice,

if he is once allow'd his own sense of the words of scripture, independent of the customs, manners and ways of speaking of those, who lived about the time of the first institution of this rite, and the interpretations of those who wrote in the early ages of christianity,

anity, he may gain some advantage in the present controversy. If, by an excess of complaisance, the good-natur'd reader will take his glosses on the text, even contrary to the manifest and obvious intention and purport of our LORD and the inspired writers, his victory will be complete. But, as several learned divines are inclined to do neither, he has met with more than one antagonist; tho' no one proceeds more modestly or more methodically in his observations than the ingenious writer before us.

Mr. Bowyer, in his *preface*, says, the common observation, that men are apt to run from one extreme to another, is verified in no case more than in disputes about the sacrament of the LORD's Supper. While those of the church of Rome conceive too high notions of it, the *Socinians*, and their favourers, think too meanly of that sacred rite. The author, whom he attacks, has been sufficiently careful to avoid one of these extremes. The reader need not be told which is here meant. In order to shew how exactly the *Plain Account* tallies with that given by the *Socinians*, Mr. Bowyer represents the doctrine of *Socinus* and his principal adherents, in their own words; and, in an opposite column, gives us quotations from the treatise in question, which seem little less or more than translations of those passages; and this we may presume may be the reason why our author does not present us with

any other *English* of the passages cited from those writers.

Mr. Bowyer, having dispatched this point, goes on to shew the disagreement between the doctrine of the *Plain Account*—and that of the church of *England*, in regard to this sacrament. This also is performed by placing the language of that book and the terms employ'd in the *articles*, *homilies*, *rubrics*, &c. in opposite columns.

Like all who have made remarks on the *Plain Account*, he agrees with the author in his four first propositions; * but justly excepts against his fifth; viz. "That it is of small importance to christians to know what the many writers upon this subject, since the evangelists and apostles, have affirmed;" for which he gives the usual, well-known reasons. Notwithstanding the great usefulness of the fathers, as that author has not, so neither does Mr. Bowyer profess to make much use of them. He proposes to correct *false*, and give *true* notions of the LORD's Supper; evince the grand necessity of frequenting it; and shew the due manner of worthily receiving it. In this view he lays down the six following propositions. I. *That the bread and wine in the LORD's supper are the body and blood of CHRIST in power and effect.* II. *That the great end of this institution is, not only to put us in mind of CHRIST and his death; but to put GOD in mind, to offer a memorial before him; or that this is a commemorative and representative*

* See Vol. I. *Articles xl, lxvii.*

sacrifice.

sacrifice. III. That it is a covenanting rite, and an act of communicating with GOD. IV. That there are promises made, and privileges annexed to the worthy receiving of it; and what these are. V. That it is a duty of grand importance, of equal obligation with any moral duty; and which ought frequently to be performed. VI. That a previous examination, and holy preparation are requisite; and wherein consists that worthiness, and unworthiness, with which it may be received. Each of these being proved from the words of the institution, and other passages of scripture, our author undertakes to answer the objections made against it by the writer under examination.

That the outward elements are not mere bread and wine, only empty signs; but the body and blood of CHRIST, tho' not in substance, yet in power and efficacy; or that they are means of conveying all the benefits of CHRIST's death, Mr. Bowyer thinks evident from several texts of the New Testament, which are here distinctly considered. In this discussion, he first insists on the titles, with which they are dignified and distinguished. Thus CHRIST says, without any restriction or limitation, *This is my body----This is my blood.* His apostles call it the communion of the body and blood of CHRIST. They tell us, that *not discerning the Lord's body*, in this sacrament, is eating and drinking unworthily; and that he, who thus eats and

drinks, is guilty of the body and blood of the LORD; eateth and drinketh damnation to himself. "But why all this, as our author asks, if the bread and wine are no more than mere empty signs, nothing else but mere membrances, without any life and spirit in them?" Hence it is concluded, that the lower sense, of which the words of our Saviour are susceptible, is, that this is my body and blood in efficacy, i. e. they are the instruments or means of conveying the benefits of his body given, and of his blood shed for us: they are not only representative, but also *ab initio*. As a man may say of the writings of his estate, *This is my estate*, as they convey and secure it to him.

A second argument in proof of the truth proposed is taken from the account here given of what our blessed Saviour did to this bread and this cup: he eucharistized, he blessed them, and then pronounced them his body and blood. We have already had occasion to observe the cavil employ'd by the author of the *Plain Account* against the English version, in order to remove this notion of blessing the bread and wine.* Mr. Bowyer says little more in reply to it, than what has been already observed in the place refer'd to at the bottom of the page. To avoid repetition therefore, we proceed to the third scripture authority here alledged, that text of St. Paul; *The bread, which we break, is*

* See Vol. I. Page 323. Article xl.

at the communion of the body of CHRIST? The cup, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of CHRIST? In the examination of this proof, it is observed that St. Paul "seems to interpret, and to be the best interpreter of the words "of our Saviour; and to give us "the true sense of them. He "doth not say, the *bread* is the "body; the *cup* is the *blood* of "CHRIST; nor that they are "the types, the figures, the sym- "bols of them: but that it is still "bread, which we break; and "therefore not changed in *nature* "and *substance*, but different "from the body and blood of "CHRIST: that they are more "than mere empty *signs* or "figures; since these commun- "icate nothing; whereas this "bread and this *cup* are, by the "divine command and appoint- "ment, by covenant and pro- "mise, made the *instrumental* "means of conveying, or com- "municating the *body* and *blood* "of CHRIST to us, in *power* "and *efficacy*." The conclusion is, that these words equally de- stroy the doctrine of *transubstan- tiation*, and the error of the Socinians, who ascribe no *spiritual* efficacy to the *eucharist*. Mr. Bowyer here finds a plain difference between that which *communicates*, viz. the *bread* and the *cup*; and that which is *communicated*, viz. the *body* and *blood* of CHRIST; and taxes his author with saying nothing of the latter; which he thinks no small omission.

From this text Mr. Bowyer passes to another of the same

apostle: *For by one spirit we are all baptized into one body, and have been all made to drink into one spirit*, 1 Cor. xii. 13. Here it is observed, that most and the best interpreters refer the former part of these words to *baptism*, the latter to the *LORD's supper*. The author of the *Plain Account* excepts against this interpretation; because this rite was never represented by the "one particular "part of it which consists in "drinking; and because drinking "at the *LORD's table* was never "expressed by him by being "made to drink into the spirit." But, says our author, supposing this the only place where this rite is thus represented, why should not the whole be represented by *drinking* only, as it is in other places, by *eating* only? Mr. Bowyer having fully defended this text, produceth one more on the same head: *It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life*, John vi. 63. In order to make these words serviceable to the doctrine proposed, it was necessary to prove that they, and the words preceding them, are to be understood of the sacrament of the *LORD's Supper*. As Mr. Johnson, in his *Unbloody Sacrifice*, has already done this in a satisfactory manner, the reader is once for all refer'd to him. The text being cleared from the objections of the author of the *Plain Account*, it is concluded that "the true mean- "ing of it seems to be as the "primitive fathers understood it: "the Holy Spirit accompanies the "symbols of CHRIST's flesh and "blood;

" blood ; which are therefore
" said to be spirit and life."

The end of this institution comes next to be considered ; and, according to the doctrine of the second proposition, the sacrament of the LORD's supper is of a *sacrificial nature*, or a *commemorative and representative sacrifice*. This is proved first, from that celebrated prophecy : *From the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles ; and in every place shall be offered unto my name incense and a pure offering*, Mal. i. 11. " As " incense signifies prayers ; so " also, says our author, the " original word for *pure offering*, " *mincha*, signifies a *meal offering*." At the bottom of the page Kercher is quoted, affirming that the word here specified is used in the law of Moses only for a sacrifice of meal or wheat. It is indeed used to signify that sort of sacrifice, Levit. ii. and elsewhere ; but does not seem confined to that only in the original text of the Old Testament, Gen. iv. Cain brought of the fruit of the ground, an offering (mincha) unto the LORD. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof ; and the LORD had respect unto Abel, and to his offering (minchatho.) The same word is used in a general sense twice in 1 Sam. ii. 29. by the *palmist*, *Psal.* xx. ver. 3. xcvi. ver. 8, &c. and by the English translators rendered an *offering*. So that, tho' the *eucharist* is a *sacrifice*, the words of the prophet will not necessarily

point out the matter of this sacrifice, for it is evident that *mincha* does not only or always signify *oblation farrea*, a *meal-offering*, as is here asserted. And tho' it had by the *Jews* been confined to that sense, there is no manner of necessity of understanding it so in this place for a reason which we take from our author himself ; viz. because " the words were spoken, not of " the *Jews*, but of the *Gentiles* " turned unto GOD ;" and consequently the term in question may, and probably does, signify in this place an *oblation or offering*, in the same extensive sense, as in the text of *Genesis* above quoted.

But, secondly, the words of the institution prove the doctrine of the second proposition. *He* *bread, and gave thanks, and* ~~it, and gave unto them, saying~~ *This is my body, which is given for you.* From which words Mt. Bouyer reasons thus : " That " which is here spoken of by " our blessed Saviour, was then " given. That which was " then given was given, not " unto man, but unto GOD ; for " when our blessed Saviour gave " it unto the apostles, saying, " take, eat, he at the same time " tells them that it was given. " Now giving it unto them to eat, " and giving it for them, are " two very different actions ; the " one directed unto man, the " other unto GOD ; given unto " GOD for them, which is the " same as offer'd unto GOD, or " sacrificed for them. That " which was thus given unto " GOD, was bread : that which " our Saviour says was then " given,

“ given, he calls his *body*: that “ which he calls his *body*, he gave “ to the apostles to *eat*: that “ which he gave them to *eat*, “ he *blessed*: that which he “ *blessed*, he *took*, that which he “ *took* was *bread*; therefore “ *bread*, *consecrated bread*, or “ *bread blessed*, was here *given*, “ and offered unto *God*. “ At the same time, our blessed “ Saviour, under the symbols of “ *bread* and *wine*, offered up his “ own *body* and *blood*. This is “ my *body given*; not that *shall* “ *be*, but *now given*, or offered “ unto *God* for you. He there- “ fore made the oblation of him- “ self, when he instituted the “ *eucharist*. The *magistration* of “ him was indeed performed upon “ the *cross*; but the *oblation* of “ him was begun before, carried “ on, and not ended till he “ entered into the *holy of holies*, “ and there presented or offered “ up himself before *God* for us. “ But, says our author, tho’ “ the former words of the in- “ stitution were not so to be “ understood; yet the command “ that follows them, very much “ favours this notion: *τυτοντος* “ *εις την εργην αραμανον*, *Do this in* “ *remembrance of me*, as the “ English translators have ren- “ dered the words.” Here it is observed that “ the *Plain Account* “ in a great measure depends on “ this version; and that if they “ were rendered, *offer this for a* “ *memorial of me*, its foundation “ is cast down.” In justification “ of the translation proposed, Mr. Bowyer, after Dr. *Hicks*, tells us that the word *τυτοντος* in

the LXX. signifies *offer*, when joined to a thing capable of being offered to *God*. The word *αραμανον* likewise is a *sacrificial* word, and so used *Levit. xxiv. 7*, and *Numb. x. 10*. In both which places we read *εις αραμανον*; so that as the term there signifies *to bring to God's remembrance*, it is natural to give it the same sense in the institution of the *eucharist*.

The fourth argument, here urged in favour of the *sacrificial nature* of the *Lord's supper*, is taken from those passages of scripture, which plainly intimate that christians have an *altar*, and therefore a *material sacrifice*; these being relative terms. The first is *Matt. ver. 23, 24*. *If thou bring thy gift to the altar, &c.* “ That this must be a *material gift*, is evident, in “ that it might be brought to, “ and left at the *altar*. That “ this is an evangelical precept, “ not applicable to the *Jews*, “ but a standing rule for all chri- “ slians, in all ages, Mr. *Mede* “ has long since proved; because “ there was no such thing com- “ manded by the law, to those “ who came to offer sacrifice; “ and it is not probable that our “ Saviour would give a new law “ relating to the *Jewish sacrifices*, “ which he was going to abolish: “ because it is part of the sermon “ from the mount, which is for “ ever obliging upon all christi- “ ans, &c.” If this way of reasoning does not appear strictly conclusive, our author's zeal, at least, is to be commended, which lets nothing escape notice, that

may tend to exert the dignity of the holy eucharist.

The next text to this purpose is that of St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 20, &c. *They sacrifice to devils, and not to GOD ; and I would not that you have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the LORD and the cup of devils ; ye cannot be partakers of the LORD's table, and the table of devils.* As the table of devils is plainly an altar erected unto *idols*, the table of the LORD therefore evidently signifies the christian altar ; " so that, as our author concludes, here are no less than three arguments in this passage in favour of the sacrificial nature of the sacrament ; the comparing the table of the LORD with the table of devils : the partaking of the eucharist, with the Gentiles partaking of their sacrifices ; and the having communion with CHRIST, by partaking of it, as the Jews had with GOD and the Gentiles with the devils by their sacrifices." This is the universally received sense of the apostle's discourse ; but the author of the *Plain Account* has discover'd or invented another which Mr. Bowyer considers at large : shews that the *Passchal supper* was a *feast upon a sacrifice* : that the *LORD's supper* answers to the *passchal supper* upon the *sacrificed lamb*, as *baptism* doth to *circumcision* : that as the eating of the *passover* was a *feast upon a sacrifice*, so also is the eating the *LORD's supper* ; and the *table* from which it is eaten, being the same from which it is offered, might there-

fore be properly called the *table of the LORD*, which answers to the *Jewish altar*, ver. 18.

The author of the *Plain Account* had said, " the only thing that answers to the *altar*, on which the sacrifices were offer'd, was that very cross on which CHRIST died." To this it is answered with the distinction, already mention'd, between the *oblation* and *ma<ration* ; conformably to the practice of offering all the sacrifices while alive ; the former being an act of the priest's office ; the latter might be perform'd by another. The same author, tho' not fond of the fathers, doth not absolutely renounce the use of them, when he imagines them favourable to his system. St. Chrysostom, in *Hom. xvii. on Epist. to the Hebrews*, says Θυσία τελετή ; and adds, μάρτυρες διατάσσοντες λαζαρία δοκίμας ; which words are thus loofly translated : *I call it a sacrifice ; but indeed it is not a sacrifice, but the remembrance of a sacrifice.* Whereupon Mr. Bowyer observes, that Mr. Mede, and Mr. Johnson have urged this very passage to prove that CHRIST is offered in this sacrament, not *hypostatically*, as the *Papist*'s would have it, but *commemoratively* only. As this is the first and only father in the early centuries who is cited against the eucharist being a sacrifice, it is observed that the authority of one against so great a multitude who assert it, is of little or no importance. However, St. Chrysostom is not to be given up ; for there is no one who more frequently calls it a sacrifice, without any abatement.

ment. " But the *antithesis* here " does not lie between Θυσίαν ποιεῖν " and πάκτωσις ἀπομενεῖν " Θυσία; but runs thus: οὐ αλλα " Θυσία παρατίθεται ἀπομενεῖν τοτε αλλα " ταῦτα ταῦτα παρατίθεται, &c. " Not another sacrifice, as the " high priest then did, but con- " stantly the same, yea rather, " &c." The last observation on this article is, that throughout the rubrics of the church of *England*, the name constantly made use of is the *communion table*, or simply *the table*, never *altar*. To this Mr. *Bowyer* replies, the word *table* is there used four times: the *holy table* once, and the *LORD's table* five; but the *communion table* not once; and that the *LORD's table* is equivalent to *altar*, as appears from *Ezek. xxxix. 20. xli. 22. Mal. i. 12.* to which is added, that from the *sacrificial* expressions of the first liturgy of *Edward VI.* it is evident that our first reformers believed the *LORD's supper* to be a *sacrifice*; that, tho' in the second liturgy of *Edward VI.* some expressions were omitted, the church did not then alter her opinion in regard to the doctrine of the *sacrifice*; because, in the same act of parliament, which ordered the *alterations*, it was declared that the *first book, for administration of the sacraments, was agreeable to the word of GOD, and the primitive church, &c.*

The last text produced is *Heb. xiii. 10.* *We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat, who serve the tabernacle.* From which it is thus reason'd: " and " if an *altar*, then a *sacrifice*, " capable of oral *manducation*."

This is too obvious to want explanation, but is not proof against exception. Mr. *Bowyer*, having defended this plain consequence, comes to the surprising passage in the *Plain Account*, where the author ventures to affirm that " this duty itself, strictly taken, " is comprehended within the " limits of *eating* and *drinking*, " with a due *remembrance*.... " that it ought always to be " considered, as distinct from " all *expressions, prayers, and thanksgivings*." What inference can be drawn from this doctrine, but that which Mr. *Bowyer* draws? " If this be a " true account, there is no occasion of a minister to officiate, " or of the *assembling ourselves together* for the performance of " it; at least, it may be done in " a *silent meeting*." But our author proceeds; and shews how contrary this is to the *scripture account*, and the account given by the most *early* fathers.

The third *proposition* necessarily follows from the former; for if the *sacrament* be a *sacrifice*; if partaking of the *sacrament* be a *feast upon a sacrifice*, it must of consequence be a *covenanting rite*. In proof of this *proposition*, it is urged that *circumcision* and the *passover* were *covenanting rites*: *baptism* and the *LORD's supper* are instituted in their room; therefore they are to be esteem'd *covenanting rites*. Add to this, that the word *covenant* is used by our blessed Saviour and *St. Paul* in the very form of the institution; and *JESUS CHRIST* says, *he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my*

blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him, John vi. 56. The last argument offer'd for the support of this doctrine is taken from those scriptures, where it is either expressly said, or plainly implied, that christians hold communion with GOD and with CHRIST; 1 Cor. x. 16, 18, 20. 1 John i. 3. These being explain'd, Mr. Bowyer takes notice that his author, through his whole Account, "seems to lay the main stress on the condition of the covenant alone, without considering the means of conveying the benefits of it to those, who perform the covenant; whereas our performance of the condition, amendment of life, or even obedience, without wilful transgression, gives us no covenanted right to salvation if we wilfully neglect the instituted means of conveying it."

The author of the *Plain Account* is very fond of this assertion; "the death of CHRIST is the only seal of the covenant." But it is answered that the blood of CHRIST merits, effects, not seals the covenant: that CHRIST is the *Mediator of the new covenant*: that through his blood it is made with all men; it is our ransom, the price of our redemption, and what purchaseth the benefits of the covenant to all who comply with the terms of it. "But, continues our author, it is nowhere expressly said to be the seal of the covenant, nor are we said to be seal'd by it. This is rather ascribed to the holy Spirit, Eph. i. 13, iv. 30.

" 2 Cor. i. 22. from which it is evident that christians are said to be seal'd after they believed (and were baptized;) and in what ordinance can we more justly suppose that christians are sealed with the earnest of the Spirit, than in the LORD's supper?" The sum of the matter, according to Mr. Bowyer, is this: "GOD the Father makes a new covenant with all men: GOD the Son is the *Mediator* of this covenant; and through his blood purchases the benefits of it for them: GOD the *Holy Ghost* seals, confirms, secures these benefits to those particular persons, who agree to, and perform the conditions of it in the sacraments of *baptism* and the *LORD's supper*.

We are now come to the fourth proposition, which sets forth the promises made, and privileges annexed to the worthy receiving of the *LORD's supper*. Having answered the objections against admitting any such thing, Mr. Bowyer proceeds to shew what benefits are annexed to the worthy performance of this duty, which are the *pardon of past sins*: the *assistance of the holy Spirit for the time to come*, or *an increase of grace to enable us to overcome them*; and *nourishment unto eternal life*.

The question first proposed is, whether there be any outward visible sign, appointed by CHRIST himself, as a means to convey *forgiveness of sins* committed after baptism. "We have, says Mr. Bowyer, such an outward, "visible

"visible sign, ordained by CHRIST himself; and of which he says, 'This is the covenant in my blood, which is shed for you — for many — for the remission of sins.' Now if these words prove, as has been shewn, that this is a covenanting rite, and that remission of sins is part of this covenant: if this cup communicates to us the blood of CHRIST, i. e. all the benefits of CHRIST's blood shed for us, as has also been shewn, one of which is *forgiveness*; then the consequence seems plain and undeniable that this is a means of conveying remission of sins to the worthy partakers thereof."

For the support of this doctrine, the words of our Saviour, *John xx. 23. Whosoever sins ye remit, &c.* are explained as a commission to the apostles, and their lawful successors to *remit* or *retain* sins in the right and due administration of the two sacraments, or by refusing the benefit of them to persons not well prepared and qualified. So that admission to the sacraments is the only *plenary absolution* requir'd; tho' the church of *England* seems, in some cases at least, to require *absolution* previous to communion.* Accordingly, Mr. *Bouyer* takes the known story of *Serapion* to be full to his purpose. "He had lapsed in the time of persecution, and not being admitted again to the *communion*, till he lay on his death-bed, is said to be *absolved* by receiving the sa-

"crament." We shall not detain our readers with an enquiry into the justness of the translation of the words from *Eusebius*, but proceed with our author, who is positive he has the practice and belief of the primitive church on his side; that *baptism* and the *LORD's supper* are the only outward means given and *ordain'd* by *CHRIST* himself for the remission of sins. To this purpose, he produces two passages from *St. Chrysostom*; one setting forth the necessity of receiving the holy *eucharist*; the other, fairly translated, runs thus: *Some saying that it is not safe for them to approach baptism, if there is no second remission; others that it is not safe for such as have sinned to partake of the mysteries, unless there be a second remission.* From which it is concluded, that *St. Chrysostom* plainly intimates that it was his opinion, and the opinion of christians in his time, that *baptism* and the *LORD's supper* were instituted means, and the only two instituted means of *absolution*." This is followed by some reflections on the doctrine of the church of *Rome* in regard to the effects of the *eucharist*, and the doctrine of *absolution*. If the *Romanists* have extended the power of *absolution* too far, our author is of opinion that many *Protestants* are mistaken, when they will not allow *CHRIST* has given his ministers any power, in any respect, by any means, to convey the *forgiveness* of sins.

This doctrine being laid down

* *Exhortation before Communion Service.*

and explain'd, Mr. Bowyer examines the objections brought against it in the *Plain Account*. Among other things, the author of that treatise had said, the public office of the church of *England* does not suppose the *worthy partaking* of the *LORD's supper* does itself operate this *forgiveness*; but it is made part of a prayer to *God* that they, who *have partaken* of it *may obtain* remission of their sins, and all other benefits, &c. On the contrary, says Mr. Bowyer, our church, in this same office, plainly ascribes it to the *worthy partaking* of this sacrament; for which he quotes the *exhortation* to the *communicants*, the prayer immediately following the *preface*, and one of the prayers appointed to be read after the *LORD's prayer*. Hence it is concluded, "whatever the words cited by the aforesaid author signify, it is plain that the church does not mean that remission of sins is not already obtained by the worthy communicant, except she contradicts herself. That, after all, this petition plainly relates to the final remission at the last day. when only we can obtain all other benefits of CHRIST's passion.

The second privilege annexed to a due performance of this duty, is the assistance of *God's Holy Spirit*. the increase of grace, to enable us to overcome; a privilege acknowledged by all christian churches. Mr. Bowyer thinks this sufficiently proved by the texts of scripture already urged, particularly under the first

and third *propositions*; so that he does little more here than retort his author's objections; and then proceeds to the third privilege, viz. nourishment to *eternal life*; which he shews from several texts is a doctrine deliver'd by our Saviour with great variety of expressions, affirmatively and negatively, especially in the sixth chapter of St. John. "Upon these words of our Saviour, says Mr. Bowyer, is this doctrine chiefly grounded: upon these words the most primitive fathers, with one consent, do teach that this sacramental meat and drink is the principle of a happy resurrection, the nourishment to eternal life.

The importance of the duty of communicating, of frequently receiving this holy sacrament, the subject of the fifth *proposition*, is evident from what has been advanced under the former propositions. It is farther manifest from the express command of JESUS CHRIST, *Do this in remembrance of me*. "Tho' this be a positive command, as our author very justly observes, yet we are as much obliged to obey it, to perform this, as much as to perform any moral duty. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and offend in one point (wilfully) he is guilty of all, James ii. 10. The reason is the same which the apostle here gives; the authority of the law-giver." To this is added the text of St. Paul, οὐτις ἀπτός, οὐ σωμα οὐ πόνος οὐ μέν, &c. which in the English version is render'd, *We being many are one bread*

bread and one body ; for we are all partakers of that one bread. Our author, who is not alone in this point, thinks the words should rather be translated, because there is one bread, we being many are one body, &c. The text, thus read, contains a strong proof of the importance of the doctrine here delivered. It ascribes our being one body to our partaking of this one bread : it gives the one as a reason for the other : it plainly intimates that we are living members of CHRIST by partaking, and only by partaking of this one bread ; and consequently, that they who do not partake of this one bread, are not living members of CHRIST. This reasoning is enforced by comparing the expression here used with that of being *baptized into one body*, in order to make us members of CHRIST. How severe soever this doctrine may appear, it was that of the primitive church, and the primitive practice was agreeable to it, as our author observes ; none were then reckon'd among the number of *faithful*, but *communicants*, none else were permitted to join in all the public prayers.

The necessity of *frequent communion* arises from the nature of the duty itself, as explain'd in the foregoing part of this treatise. The practice of the apostles and first christians, among whom the celebration of the *eucharist* always was a constant stated part of the public service, being urged, it is asked, " since their practice is thought a sufficient ground for the perpetual observation of the

" LORD's day, on which they
" met to break bread ; why is it
" not equally so for the admini-
" stration of the LORD's supper
" on every LORD's day ? If it
" is said, there is no command
" for the latter, may it not
" equally be said, there is no
" command for the former ; and
" that there is equal authority
" for both ?"

The author of the *Plain Account* quotes *Acts* ii. 42, and xx. 7. where it is said that the first converts continued in the apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayers : that upon the first day of the week they came together to break bread. He allows that those texts are to be understood of the LORD's supper ; but declares that *Acts* ii. 46. must be understood of eating in common, in the ordinary sense of the term. Here Mr. Bowyer asks, " Why must it ? when the word does evidently signify the temple, and is so translated, Luke xi. 51." And the phrase *κατ' οίκον* cannot signify from house to house, but may and must rather signify the place of religious worship. To all this it is added, that the writer under examination, does not at all insist on the duty of frequent communion ; that he does not much insist on the duty of communicating itself, which might have been expected from one who pretends to give an account of the nature and end of the LORD's supper ; and that the tendency of his book is to lead men to the neglect, nay even to the contempt of this holy rite.

The duty of *previous examination* and *holy preparation*, considered as the last thing proposed, is here shewn to follow necessarily from the former propositions. Our author treats of them both distinctly; but more largely of the latter. Under the article of *examination*, he considers the meaning of St. Paul's admonition, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat, &c.* 1. Cor. xi. 28. The original word, *εξαγορά*, as is here observed, signifies to *examine*, to *make trial*, and to *approve* ourselves; which admits of several kinds or degrees. We may *approve* ourselves to our own consciences, to others, and to God. That the word is here to be taken in the fullest and highest sense, is proved at large. In the New Testament it is frequently rendered to *prove* or *approve*, and never to *examine* but in the text before us. This *approbation*, not only to our own consciences, but to God, may require great length of time, as is shewn from an enumeration of the crimes, which the apostle censures in the *Corinthians*. Whence it is concluded that if we take the command of St. Paul to mean no more than to *examine*, there seems no occasion of his giving or their receiving this command, to *examine* themselves whether they were guilty or not of things which were *notorious*, and of which he plainly accuses them; he must therefore be understood to mean that, after *examination* into their inward dispositions, they should *make trial* of their *repenting truly* of their sins, till they *approved* them-

selves, not only unto their own consciences, but unto others, and unto God also; that they were truly penitent.

The author of the *Plain Account*, seems sometimes to express himself so ambiguously, and so inconsistently, that Mr. Bowyer declares it difficult to understand, and more difficult to reconcile him with himself. But, as it may be supposed the *propositions*, and the arguments offered for their support, contain that author's meaning, they are here examined briefly and judiciously; and it is made appear that the *examination*, required by St. Paul, does not relate only to *intemperance* and *indecency* of behaviour at the time of receiving.

The *preparation* required for *partaking worthily* of this holy sacrament, consists in nothing more or less than in *keeping our baptismal covenant whole and undefiled*, or *if we have broken it, in renewing and confirming it again by repentance*. "That nothing more is required appears, not only from the nature of the thing, the *baptismal vow* containing the *whole duty* of a *christian*; but from the practice of the primitive church, which immediately admitted *baptized persons to confirmation* and to *the holy communion*. . . . That nothing less is required, is evident in that if we wilfully break, and live in the breach of our *baptismal covenant*. . . . we are no longer in a state of favour and communion with God, &c." But what are the sins which violate the *covenant*?

of baptism, and make us unfit for the **LORD's** Supper? "Presumptuous sins, says our author, "sins wilfully committed, one act of the greater sins, or the going on in a continual course of sin and wickedness, nay wilful habits of the lesser sins, and daily commissions of them." Such notorious offenders, as Mr. Bowyer rightly observes, were not admitted to communion upon their open profession of repentance, much less on the easy terms of the *Plain Account*; no: the primitive Church put them to open *penance*; and required them by their outward behaviour, for a considerable time, to give a proof of their inward conversion. "This," says Mr. Bowyer, is that *godly discipline* in the primitive Church, "which our own wishes to be restored; were her *rubric* and orders strictly observed, discipline would not be at so low an ebb as now it is." See the *rubric* before the *communion service*; and *Canon xxvi.* A. D. 1603.

From the *universal* and *early* practice of the Church of **CHRIST** in this particular, it is justly presumed, that those texts of scripture, on which she grounds her claim to this power, and her strict notion of *preparation*, are rightly understood. Such are chiefly *Matt. xviii. 17, 18.* *John xx. 23.* *2 Cor. vii. 9, 10.* To which is added the case of the incestuous *Corinthian*. Our author, having occasion to mention *confession* among the *penitential Acts* required by way of *preparation*, observes this is to be made not only

unto **GOD** but unto *men*; confess your sins one to another. *James v.*

16. "Tho' this practice of the primitive Church is not likely to be restored; yet it is in the power of private christians, it is their duty, says our author, in obedience to this command of **GOD**." The doctrine here insisted on is so disagreeable to the present taste, even of many who profess themselves members of the Church of *England*; which tho' she does not rigorously insist on *private confession*, yet recommends it; that Mr. Bowyer thinks it necessary to screen himself under the authority of the late doctor *Marshall*, and those who are cited by him in his *penitential discipline*. The authorities by him quoted in favour of *private confession* are the *Augustian confession*, *Calvin* and *Zanchy*. The power of the keys being farther supported by other texts of the *New Testament*, our author proceeds to shew that the honour of the Church, the good of others, and the advantage of the sinner himself require that such, as have been *unholy*, should undergo a strict *trial*, and give good evidence of their conversion before they are admitted to communion.

Mr. Bowyer having thus endeavour'd to establish *true notions* of *worthy preparation*, thinks it will be more easy to correct those that are *false* and *dangerous*. Of this sort are the *notions* started in the *Plain Account*. In opposition to them, our author makes a particular application of several things he had said in the foregoing part of this treatise; and confirms his

own notions of preparation, which are indeed those of every serious christian, who has read the scripture, or his catechism, by the qualifications, which GOD himself expressly required, and the pious Israelites thought necessary in order to eating the passover worthily. This being performed in a strong and natural manner, Mr. Bowyer quotes a long passage from the *Plain Account*, in which it is said that what had been advanced in that book "doth not seem to imply any thing contrary to the discipline of christians in *Justin Martyr's* time; who informs us, that they only were allowed to partake of the eucharist, who lived as CHRIST commanded; and that this general and loose expression is declared by the most learned writers, who use it, to be meant only of an imperfect obedience to CHRIST's laws, &c." In reply to this, it is observed that the author seems to express himself, as if he would have it thought there were no other authorities in the first ages of christianity but *Justin Martyr's* for proving this point of discipline. Mr. Bowyer, however, supplies the defect in his margin with a cloud of illustrious witnesses, such as St. Clement, *Hermas*, St. Ignatius, St. Irenæus,

Origen, St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine. He then produces the passage of *Justin Martyr* in the original, with an English translation of it, where it appears that it is pronounced as unlawful for a man, who doth not live as CHRIST commanded, as for unbelievers and unbaptized persons, to partake of the eucharist.

The *True Account*, &c. concludes with a pathetic exposition of the pernicious tendency of the doctrine contain'd in the *Plain Account*; such as hardening sinners in their sin, by removing the greatest restraint to it: the profanation and prostitution of the holy Sacrament: encouraging unbelievers to deride this holy institution: confirming the *Quakers* in their contempt of this most holy ordinance: reviving *Socinian* notions: hardening the common *Papists* in their superstitious notions; and furnishing their priests with an argument against the Church of England: encouraging the non-communicant in his neglect; and discouraging the communicant from taking due care in preparation. Terrible consequences indeed! but such as the book here examined is but too well known to have produced.

ARTICLE XXI.

Les Egaremens du Cœur & de l'Esprit; ou Mémoires de Mr. DE MEILCOUR. Première partie. A Paris, chez Pault, fils. 1736.
 That is, *The Errors of the Heart and Judgment; or, Memoirs of Mr. DE MEILCOUR. Part the First. Printed at Paris for Pault, junior. 1736. Octavo. Containing 174 Pages, exclusive of the Dedication, and Preface.*

“ **A** Man who writes can only have one of these two views, to please or to instruct. It is the happiness of very few authors to be able to do both. He, who undertakes to instruct, either will not condescend to amuse his readers, or has not the talent for doing it: the entertaining writer has not strength enough for instructing; hence it necessarily follows that the former is always dry, the latter ever trifling.” This is the judicious reflection, with which Mr. *Crebillon*, son to the celebrated Mr. *Crebillon*, of the French Academy, opens his *preface* to the book before us.

Romances are commonly monstrous compositions of extravagant characters, and surprising events. For which reason they are justly treated with contempt by men of sense. Our ingenious author, however, is of opinion that this kind of writing might be rendered extremely useful, were it well managed; were it, like a comedy, made a lively and natural representation of human life, a censure on vices and follies. The following piece is formed on this plan. Mr. *de Meilcour*, the hero of this *rational romance*, is to appear, in the first and second parts of it,

which are to contain his first amours, a young gentleman full of simplicity, without art or disguise, and unacquainted with the world. In the sequel we are to see him full of false ideas, giving into a thousand extravagancies, and that less by his own inclinations, than by the influence of persons who have an interest in corrupting his heart and mind. At last, he is to be reformed, and owe all his virtues to a valuable lady. The characters are so finely drawn, the passions so well touched, and the title is so beautiful, that we with impatience expect the remainder of these entertaining and instructive memoirs.

The young adventurer enters into the world, at the age of seventeen, with all the advantages, which can recommend him to the *grand monde*. His father had left him in possession of a title, and heir to a considerable estate. He is by nature inclined to think, at least, as well of himself as he deserves; if his mother could not quite cure him of his pride and vanity, at least she obliged him to lay some restraint on them. At his first appearing in the world the idea of pleasure is the only one that strikes his mind. The little employment usually given to persons

of his age and rank, false notions of politeness, and example, all conspire to engage him in the pursuit of pleasure. He has impetuous passions; or, to speak more properly, a warm imagination, easily affected.

In the midst of the noise and splendor, which constantly surround him, Mr. *de Meilcour* feels a strong desire of a happiness, of which he has no distinct idea. It is some time before he comprehends what sort of pleasures he wants; at last he finds nothing but conversation with the ladies can remove the uneasiness he feels. Without being sensible of the violence of his inclinations, he frequently throws himself into their company; and perceives they alone can bestow the wished for happiness. He then resolves to work himself into a tender passion; but knows not how to make his choice. The sentiment, with which one inspires him, are the next moment destroy'd by the charms of another: he is attached to no one lady, and finds something engaging in all of them. He has so little experience in women, that he imagines a declaration of love would be received as an offence: he is apprehensive that the person addressed to will not give him the hearing; and considers a repulse as the most shocking affront a man can receive. To these considerations he joins an excessive timidity, which nothing can conquer; and, which does not allow him to make use of the most favourable opportunities that could offer. Full of these notions of respect for the fair sex,

taken from *romances*, our young gentleman converses with the ladies about half a year, desirous of loving, but ignorant of the manner of engaging their affections. He then begins to feel himself particularly attracted by one lady, whom he sees almost every day, either at her own house, or at his mother's.

The marchioness *de Lursay* (for that was the lady's name) was a widow, had formerly been a coquette, and even engaged in some galantries. An intrigue, which took air, and blasted her reputation, had disgusted her of the noisy pleasures of the *grand monde*. As susceptible of tender impressions as ever, but grown more prudent, she was at last convinced that women owe their ruin less to their frailty than to the little care they take in conducting their intrigues. Notwithstanding the grave air she assumed, she was still suspected; and Mr. *de Meilcour* was perhaps the only person when she could have deceived. Madame *de Lursay* had form'd a project of engaging his affections, and was very well qualified for succeeding in her designs. Tho' near forty years of age, she was a fine woman; had a lively wit, talk'd well, and with a graceful, easy air. The severity of her looks was evidently forced; and when she was not on her guard, it was easy to observe a lovely gaiety and tenderness in her eyes. She had carefully studied both sexes, and was well acquainted with all the springs which put both into motion. Patient in her revenge as in her pleasures, she knew how to wait for both, when not

not immediately in her power, she had not conversed long with Mr. *de Meilcourt*, before she understood his character, and the reasons he might have for fearing to own a passion, he might have conceived. She was therefore of opinion, that, in order to gain and secure him, it would be proper to dissemble her love for him as long as possible; that the more he was accustomed to respect her, the more he would be shocked at any precipitate step on her side. Besides, she was sensible that how ardently foever men pursue their conquests, they always love to purchase them; and that those women, who imagine they cannot surrender too soon, often repent of being to hasty in their submission. This artful lady own'd herself capable of loving; but made the conquest of her heart so difficult, required so many qualifications in the object that could affect her, and talked of so singular a manner of loving, that our young gentleman trembled whenever he thought of attempting her.

After about two months conversation, madame *de Lursay* finding her lover stupid and bashful, takes an opportunity of talking of love, and in the most artful manner imaginable obliges him to discover his passion. This is related with the utmost beauty and delicacy; as are the perplexities of Mr. *de Meilcourt* and the refined artifices of the lady. To give our reader a complete idea of her character, we transcribe the following reflections.

"A woman, when young, is more affected with the pleasure of inspiring, than feeling a passion.

" What she calls *tenderness*, is most commonly no more than a quick taste, which determines her sooner than love itself, amuses her for a time: is extinguished insensibly and without regret. The merit of gaining one lover for ever, is not so considerable in her way of thinking, as that of holding several in her chains. Rather in suspense, than fixed, continually acting with caprice, she thinks less of the man who possesses her, than of him who she wishes in possession of her. She always expects pleasure, and never enjoys it: she takes a lover less because she thinks him amiable, than to prove herself so: she often knows him she leaves no better than his successor. Perhaps, had she kept him longer, she would have loved him. But is it her fault if she is not constant? A hand-some woman depends much less on herself than on certain circumstances; and it unfortunately happens, there are so many, so unforeseen, so surprising, that we are not to be surprised, that, after so many amours, she knows neither love nor her own heart.

" Is she arrived at an age when her charms begin to decline, when men, looking on her with indifference, let her know, by the coldness of their behaviour, that they shall soon see her only with disgust? She thinks of preventing the misfortune. Formerly secure that in changing lovers she only changed pleasures; too happy now if

" if she can keep the only one
 " she possesses ; the difficulty of
 " her conquest makes it valuable.
 " Constant, from the considera-
 " tion of the loss she must sustain
 " by not being so, her heart by
 " degrees accustoms its self to a
 " rational way of thinking. Oblig-
 " ed by decency to avoid all
 " that might tend to distract or
 " corrupt her ; that she may not
 " sink into downright insipidity,
 " she finds it necessary to give
 " herself up entirely to love :
 " which having, in the former
 " part of her life, been a mo-
 " mentary employment, con-
 " founded with a thousand others,
 " becomes now her only remedy.
 " She indulges it to madness ;
 " and what we imagine a wo-
 " man's last whim, is very often
 " her first passion." Such were
 the dispositions of madame *de Lur-
 say*, when she formed the design
 of engaging Mr. *de Meilcour*'s af-
 fections.

She receives his first declaration
 in such a manner as makes the
 artless, unexperienced lover re-
 solved to think no more of her.
 However, he visits her the next
 day, but at a time when he has
 reason to suppose she will be en-
 gaged in company. He affects a
 cold air ; but the lady, who sees
 through the disguise, soon makes
 him sensible that she is mistress of
 his heart, and lets him see that he
 is not indifferent to her. He
 leaves her a second time with
 the same resolutions ; but finds
 it impossible to shake off his
 chain ; goes to her house as soon
 as possible, fully determined to
 swear he adores her, and is ready

to submit to her own terms.
 Madame *de Lursay* not being at
 home, he goes to the opera,
 where he sees a beautiful young
 lady with two other ladies.
 This new object strikes him,
 throws him into transports ; and
 he imagines himself passionately
 in love with the unknown char-
 mer. Not being able to get any
 information concerning her, he
 goes home full of perplexity. He
 thinks of Madame *de Lursay* ;
 but imagines he can now behold
 her with indifference. That
 lady comes in, throws him into
 the utmost confusion : he stands
 divided between her and the
 unknown ; but the thoughts of
 the latter as more agreeable. Two
 days being spent in quest of the
 fair unknown, and endeavouring
 to forget madame *de Lursay*, she
 makes a visit to madame *de Meil-
 cour*, takes an opportunity of
 talking to him in private, expostu-
 lates with him on his late absence,
 increases his perplexity, and gives
 him the *rendezvous* for the next
 day. Mr. *de Meilcour*, whose
 thoughts are strongly employ'd on
 the unknown, renew's his enqui-
 ries ; but in vain. He then goes
 into the *Thuilleries*, walks in the
 labyrinth, where he hears the
 voice of two women ; and having
 placed himself so as not to be
 discover'd, is agreeably surprised
 to find one of them the dear
 unknown. She was talking with
 one of the ladies, whom he had
 seen with her at the opera, and
 defending herself against a charge
 of receiving an impression from
 an unknown gentleman ; which
 she performs in a manner that
 shews

shews she is not insensible to the graces of his person. Mr. *de Meilcour* would willingly persuade himself he was the man ; but the discourse is not particular enough to give him the desired assurance. He follows her to the *Pont Royal*, where she steps into her coach, and leaves him in the utmost confusion. He returns home, more in love than ever, and convinced that his regard for madame *de Lursay* was only such as men usually profess for every handsome woman. However, he goes to that lady's house ; but so late that, not expecting him, she had resolved to see company. She receives him coldly : he returns an air of indifference ; and makes no apologies. Her dress, her eyes, her whole behaviour stagger his resolutions. Observing the impression she had made on him, she improves the opportunity, and detains him a considerable time after the rest of her visitors were gone. His timidity returns, he knows not how to make his advantage of his present situation, treats the lady with profound respect, utters protestations of constancy, and returns home.

The next day, as he is on the point of visiting madame *de Lursay*, the count *de Verfac* comes to see his mother. That gentleman, of whom our author will have frequent occasion to speak in the sequel of these memoirs, was a graceful person, of very agreeable conversation. Adored by all the women, whom he deceived and railed at perpetually. Vain, impious, hot-headed ; the most impudent *Petit Maitre* that ever

was seen ; and perhaps the more agreeable in their eyes for those very faults. He had been several years in the practice of conquering the most insensible ladies, fixing the most volatile coquets, and displacing the best established lovers ; or, if he chanced to miscarry in his attempt, he always knew how to turn matters so well to his own advantage, that the lady's reputation suffer'd as much as if she had forfeited her honour. He had framed an extraordinary jargon of his own, which, tho' strained, carried a natural air. He gave a new beauty to all he related after others ; and no man could repeat what he said in the same manner. He had formed the graces of his person as well as those of his wit ; and knew how to give himself those charms, which can neither be imitated nor described. That happy impertinence seem'd a gift of nature, which she could bestow on him alone. Richly dressed, and always with taste and grandeur, he had the air of a man of quality, even when he most affected it.

Mr. *de Meilcour* never saw this gentleman, but he studied him, and endeavour'd to copy those grand airs which he admired in him. Madame *de Meilcour*, who thought every thing ridiculous that was not natural, absolutely forbid her son to converse with Mr. *de Verfac*. This troublesome visiter enters : after a careless bow to the lady, and a sort of nod to the young gentleman, he talks of indifferent things, and then falls foul of the reputation of so many persons, that madame *de Meilcour* asks him what all the world had done

done to him that could provoke him to rail at every one he knew. *Versac*, goes on in his usual strain and madame *de Lursay*'s amours are related, probably with some exaggeration. "Does she think, says he, "with her *Plato*, whom she neither understands nor follows, she can impose on us in regard to her private rendezvous; and that we shall, in that point be as easily deceived as young fellows, who, unacquainted with the nature or number of her intrigues, think they are adoring the most venerable of goddef-

"ses, and conquering a heart that has never been surprised before?" Mr. *de Meilcourt*, fired at this discourse, and some other particulars to the same purpose, hastens to madame *de Lursay*, with an intention of being revenged on her for the ridiculous respect she had obliged him to entertain for her. — But we must wait for the publication of the second part, before we can inform our readers what passed at that lady's house on this critical occasion.

ARTICLE XXII.

LITERARY NEWS.

ROME.

THE first volume of St. *Ephrem*'s works was printed at the Vatican in 1732. The second and third are now in the press. The whole, published under the direction of cardinal *Quirini*, will make six volumes in *Folio*.

Mr. *Salvioni*, bookseller of this city, has lately published *Epitome Græcæ Palæographiæ, & de reetâ Græci Sermonis pronunciatione dissertationis*. That is, *A dissertation on the ancient manner of writing Greek, and on the true pronunciation of that language*, in *Quarto*. Written by the reverend Father *Gregorio*, a *Basilian* monk in the monastery of *Grotta Ferrata*.

We have here a new treatise in *Quarto*, entitled *De vero Rubicone, quem Cæsar contra Romanum interdictum trajecit*. That is *concerning the true Rubicon, which Cæsar passed against the Prohibition of the Roman commonwealth*.

THE